2026-yil
9(2)-son

“FAN VA TA’LIM YANGILIKLARI”

ILMIY - METODIK

JURNALI

saen.uz

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI

2026-yil
9(2)-son

Bosh muharrir:
Shoumarov G‘ayrat Bahromovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, akademik

Bosh muharrir o‘rinbosari:
Qodirov Umarali Do‘stqobilovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Mas’ul kotib:
Muqimov Alisher

Texnik muharrir:
Qarshiyev Jamshid Murotaliyevich, pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b.

TAHRIR HAY’ATI:

01.00.00 – FIZIKA-MATEMATIKA FANLARI
Ayupov Shavkat Abdullayevich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, akademik
A’zamov Abdulla, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, akademik
Zohidov Erkin A’zamovich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, professor

02.00.00 – KIMYO FANLARI
Normaxamatov Nodirali Soxobataliyevich, kimyo fanlar doktori, professor
Tojibayev Komiljon Sharobitdinovich, kimyo fanlar doktori, akademik

03.00.00 – BIOLOGIYA FANLARI
Abdurahmonov Ibrohim Yo‘lchiyevich, biologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Sulaymonov Botirjon Abdushukurovich, biologiya fanlari doktori, akademik

04.00.00 – GEOLOGIYA-MINERALOGIYA FANLARI
Fayziyev Abdulhaq Radjabovich, geologiya-mineralogiya fanlari doktori, professor
Husanov Sultonboy To‘xtayevich, geologiya-mineralogiya fanlari doktori, professor

05.00.00 – TEXNIKA FANLARI
Allayev Qahramon Rahimovich, texnika fanlari doktori, akademik
Majidov Inom Urishevich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor
Turobjonov Sadritdin Maxamatdinovich, texnika fanlari doktori, akademik
Shaumarov Said Sanatovich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor

06.00.00 – QISHLOQ XO‘JALIGI FANLARI
Namozov Shodmon Ergashovich, qishloq xo‘jaligi fanlari doktori, akademik
Shoumarov Hikmat Bahromovich, qishloq xo‘jaligi fanlari nomzodi, professor

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI
Ziyo Azamat Hamid o‘g‘li, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik
Sagdullayev Anatoliy Sagdullayevich, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik
Yusupova Diloram Yunusovna, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI
Abdurahmonov Qalandar Xodjayevich, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik
Musayev Behzod Anvarovich, iqtisod fanlari nomzodi
To‘xliyev Nurislom, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik
G‘ulomov Saidahror Saidahmedovich, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI
2026-yil
9(2)-son

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI
Nazarov Qiyom Normirzayevich, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor
Saifnazarov Ismoil Saifnazarovich, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor

10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI
Mengliyev Baxtiyor Rajabovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Sirojiddinov Shuhrat Samariddinovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Xidirov Rajab Gulmatovich, filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent (Tojikiston)

11.00.00 – GEOGRAFIYA FANLARI
Nigmatov Asqar Nigmatullayevich, geografiya fanlari doktori, professor
Tojiyeva Zulxumor Nazarovna, geografiya fanlari doktori, professor

12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR
Rustamboyev Mirzayusuf Hakimovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor
Saidov Akmal Xolmatovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, akademik
Xolmo'minov Jumanazar Toshtemirovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor
Qodirov Bobiromon Bekmurodovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI
Djurayev Risboy Haydarovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, akademik
Ibraimov Xolboy, pedagogika fanlari doktori, akademik
Musurmonova Oynisa, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Umarov Bahrom Norboyevich, pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent

14.00.00 – TIBBIYOT FANLARI
Akilov Xabibulla Ataullayevich, tibbiyot fanlari doktori, professor
Nazirov Feruz Gafurovich, tibbiyot fanlari doktori, akademik

15.00.00 – FARMATSEVTIKA FANLARI
Abdullabekova Viloyat Nurillabekovna, farmatsevtika fanlari doktori, professor
Tulaganov Abduqodir Abdurahmonovich, farmatsevtika fanlari doktori, professor

16.00.00 – VETERINARIYA FANLARI
Daminov Asadullo Suvonovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor
Jabborov Shuhrat Abdumajidovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor
G'afurov Aktam G'afurovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor

17.00.00 – SAN'ATSHUNOSLIK FANLARI
Ahmedova Nigora Rahimovna, sanatshunoslik fanlari doktori, professor
Hakimov Akbar Abdullayevich, san'atshunoslik fanlari doktori, akademik

18.00.00 – ARXITEKTURA FANLARI
Nozilov Dodo Avazovich, arxitektura fanlari doktori, professor
Uralov Axtam Sindarovich, arxitektura fanlari doktori, professor

19.00.00 – PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI
Abdusamatov Hasanboy Usmonjon o'g'li, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Barotov Sharif Ramazonovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Karimova Vasila Mamanosirovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Halimova Mashraboy Vohidovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Lazar Drajeta, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Belgrad, Serbiya)
Karpinskiy Konstantin Viktorovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Grodno, Belarussiya)
Boboyeva Sayyora Boboradjabovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Tojikiston)
Suletbayeva Ella Serikbayevna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent

Turaxonov Abdukarim Eshkuziyevich, psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent
22.00.00 – SOTSIOLOGIYA FANLARI
Bekmurodov Mansur Bobomurodovich, sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Toshmuhamedova Dilorom Gafurdjanovna, sotsiologiya fanlari doktori

23.00.00 – SIYOSIY FANLAR
Avazov Komil Xolliyevich, siyosiy fanlar bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent
Fayzullayev Alisher Omonullayevich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Hasanov Otabek Abdurashidovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori
Paxrutdinov Shukritdin Ilyasovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Omonov Baxtiyor Axtamovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Quronboyev Qahramon Qo'chqorovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor

24.00.00 – ISLOMSHUNOSLIK FANLARI
Ibrohimov Ne'matulla, filologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Islomov Zohidjon Mahmudovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI
2026-yil
9(2)-son

378.147:004.8:81

Shakirova Sardora To'lanovna,
Master of Arts, Webster University
Education and Innovation

ASSESSING INDEPENDENT LEARNING IN AI-SUPPORTED PHILOLOGY TASKS: A PROCESS-EVIDENCE MODEL UDK

Abstract. Independent learning has traditionally been assessed indirectly through essays, translations, presentations, and other academic products that students prepare outside the classroom. The widespread use of generative artificial intelligence in everyday learning has weakened the connection between the quality of a finished text and the learning process through which it was produced. A fluent paragraph, coherent argument, or polished translation can now be generated without the planning, verification, and revision that such academic work has traditionally required. This challenge is particularly relevant to philology programmes, where the assessed product is predominantly textual and therefore can be convincingly generated by artificial intelligence systems. This article develops a conceptual model for assessing the independent learning of philology students in AI-supported learning environments. Drawing on self-regulated learning theory and research on learner autonomy, the article identifies four interrelated components of independent learning that can be assessed through process evidence rather than product quality alone: goal setting and planning, strategic action, monitoring and self-evaluation, and source and tool literacy. The proposed model emphasises the assessment of how students formulate learning goals, select and use resources and AI tools, verify information, revise their work, respond to feedback, and evaluate the effectiveness of their own learning strategies.

Keywords: independent learning, self-regulated learning, assessment methodology, artificial intelligence tools, philology education, learner autonomy, process evidence, feedback literacy, academic integrity, higher education.

SUN'IY INTELLEKT YORDAMIDA BAJARILADIGAN FILOLOGIK TOPSHIRIQLARDA MUSTAQIL TA'LIMNI BAHOLASH: JARAYON DALILLARIGA ASOSLANGAN MODEL

Annotatsiya. Mustaqil ta'lim uzoq vaqt davomida talabalar tomonidan auditoriyadan tashqarida tayyorlangan esse, tarjima, taqdimot va boshqa o'quv mahsulotlari orqali bilvosita baholab kelingan. Generativ sun'iy intellekt vositalarining kundalik ta'lim jarayoniga keng kirib kelishi tayyor mahsulot sifati bilan uni yaratish jarayoni o'rtasidagi an'anaviy bog'liqlikni sezilarli darajada o'zgartirmoqda. Bugungi kunda ravon matn, izchil argumentatsiya yoki sifatli

tarjimani rejalashtirish, axborotni tekshirish va matnni qayta ishlash kabi mustaqil faoliyat bosqichlarisiz ham olish mumkin. Bu holat, ayniqsa, filologik ta'lim uchun muhim muammodir, chunki mazkur yo'nalishlarda baholanadigan o'quv mahsuloti asosan matn shaklida bo'lib, uni generativ sun'iy intellekt tizimlari yetarlicha ishonchli tarzda yaratishi mumkin. Mazkur maqolada sun'iy intellekt yordamida tashkil etiladigan ta'lim sharoitida filologiya talabalarining mustaqil ta'limini baholashga mo'ljallangan konseptual model ishlab chiqiladi. O'z-o'zini boshqarishga asoslangan ta'lim nazariyasi hamda ta'lim oluvchi avtonomiyasiga oid ilmiy yondashuvlarga tayangan holda mustaqil ta'limning to'rtta o'zaro bog'liq komponenti ajratib ko'rsatiladi: maqsad qo'yish va rejalashtirish, strategik harakat, monitoring va o'z-o'zini baholash, shuningdek, manbalar va raqamli vositalardan foydalanish savodxonligi. Taklif etilayotgan modelda talabaning faqat yakuniy mahsuloti emas, balki o'quv maqsadini belgilashi, manba va sun'iy intellekt vositalarini tanlashi, axborotni tekshirishi, ishini qayta ko'rib chiqishi, fikr-mulohazalardan foydalanishi hamda o'z ta'lim strategiyalarining samaradorligini baholashi kabi jarayonlar ham baholash obyekti sifatida qaraladi.

Kalit so'zlar: mustaqil ta'lim, o'z-o'zini boshqarishga asoslangan ta'lim, baholash metodikasi, sun'iy intellekt vositalari, filologik ta'lim, ta'lim oluvchi avtonomiyasi, jarayon dalillari, fikr-mulohaza savodxonligi, akademik halollik, oliy ta'lim.

ОЦЕНИВАНИЕ САМОСТОЯТЕЛЬНОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ В ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЗАДАНИЯХ С ПОДДЕРЖКОЙ ИСКУССТВЕННОГО ИНТЕЛЛЕКТА: МОДЕЛЬ НА ОСНОВЕ ПРОЦЕССУАЛЬНЫХ СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВ

Аннотация. Самостоятельное обучение долгое время оценивалось косвенно — по эссе, переводам, презентациям и другим учебным продуктам, которые студенты выполняли вне аудитории. Широкое распространение генеративного искусственного интеллекта в повседневной учебной деятельности изменило традиционную связь между качеством готового текста и процессом его создания. В настоящее время связный текст, логичную аргументацию или качественный перевод можно получить без полноценного выполнения таких традиционных этапов самостоятельной работы, как планирование, проверка информации и последующая доработка. Данная проблема особенно актуальна для филологического образования, поскольку оцениваемый результат в большинстве случаев представляет собой текстовый продукт, который современные системы генеративного искусственного интеллекта способны создавать на достаточно высоком уровне. В статье разрабатывается концептуальная модель оценивания самостоятельного обучения студентов-филологов в условиях использования искусственного интеллекта. На основе теории саморегулируемого обучения и исследований автономии обучающегося выделяются четыре взаимосвязанных компонента

самостоятельного обучения, которые могут оцениваться не только по качеству конечного продукта, но и на основе процессуальных свидетельств: целеполагание и планирование, стратегические действия, мониторинг и самооценка, а также грамотность работы с источниками и цифровыми инструментами. Предлагаемая модель предусматривает оценивание не только конечного результата, но и процесса обучения: постановки целей, выбора источников и инструментов искусственного интеллекта, проверки полученной информации, доработки выполненного задания, использования обратной связи и оценки эффективности собственных учебных стратегий.

Ключевые слова: самостоятельное обучение, саморегулируемое обучение, методика оценивания, инструменты искусственного интеллекта, филологическое образование, автономия обучающегося, процессуальные свидетельства, грамотность в работе с обратной связью, академическая честность, высшее образование.

Introduction. A substantial share of coursework in philology programs is completed outside direct classroom supervision like reading primary texts, compiling bibliographies, writing analytical essays, translating, annotating and reviewing. Because so much of a philology student's academic development happens in this unsupervised space, the capacity to organize and manage one's own learning is not incidental to the discipline but one of its central outcomes. However, assessment practice has not kept pace with this understanding. Most departments continue to judge independent learning through the completed essay, term paper, translation or presentation sometimes supplemented by a self-report questionnaire. The underlying assumption is that a strong final product reflects an equally strong process of planning, research, drafting and revision that took place before it.

That assumption has become considerably harder to sustain. Generative AI tools can now produce a fluent paragraph, a plausible bibliography, a competent translation or a well-organized argument without the student necessarily having carried out the intellectual work that such a product once implied. This is not simply a matter of academic dishonesty in the traditional sense; a student may use AI transparently and still submit work that reveals almost nothing about how the task was approached. The problem, in other words is evidential rather than purely ethical as assessment continues to rely on a form of output that no longer supports the inferences it once did.

Philology is exposed to this problem more directly than many other disciplines. Where a laboratory science might assess a calculation or an experimental result and an engineering program a physical artefact, philology departments assess written language itself — precisely the category of output that generative systems now produce most convincingly (Godwin-Jones, 2022). A methodology that continues to treat the finished text as the primary evidence of independent learning is therefore particularly fragile in this discipline, which makes the search for an alternative more

urgent here than in fields where the product is less easily generated.This article proposes such an alternative. It argues that independent learning should not be defined by the absence of assistance but by the degree of control a student retains over the learning process while using whatever tools are available. A student who uses AI deliberately, evaluates its output, checks relevant claims and can explain why a particular suggestion was accepted or rejected is still exercising independent judgement, even though the work was assisted. A student who submits generated material without evaluating it is not exercising that judgement, even if the resulting text is fluent. An assessment methodology that cannot distinguish between these two cases is assessing the wrong thing.

Literature review. Any attempt to reform the assessment of independent learning must begin with a clear account of what is being assessed. In much of the post-Soviet pedagogical tradition, independent learning (mustaqil ta'lim) is defined administratively, as the share of the curriculum completed outside contact hours. This definition is convenient for allocating credit and scheduling study time but it describes where learning occurs rather than what a learner is able to do and it therefore offers little guidance for assessment design.

Self-regulated learning theory provides a more workable foundation. Zimmerman (2002) describes self-regulation as a cyclical process of three phases which forethought, in which learners set goals and select strategies; performance, in which they apply and monitor those strategies and self-reflection in which they evaluate outcomes and decide what to change. Panadero's (2017) review of six influential models of self-regulated learning finds differing terminology across the field but a shared emphasis on planning, monitoring and reflection as the core mechanisms of the construct.

A parallel line of research in language education arrives at a similar position through the concept of learner autonomy. Holec (1981) defines autonomy as the capacity to take responsibility for one's own learning, including setting objectives, selecting methods and content, monitoring progress and evaluating outcomes. Benson (2011) later cautions against equating autonomy with learning in isolation, arguing that its defining feature is the degree of control a learner retains over decisions about their own learning, whatever support is available to them. Read together, self-regulation theory and learner autonomy theory make independent learning practical for assessment as an independent learner sets and adjusts goals, chooses and revises strategies, monitors progress, and evaluates the quality of the outcome. These actions leave traces, even though a finished product reveals them only indirectly.

A motivational dimension is also relevant. Sustaining effort, maintaining attention and persisting after an unsuccessful attempt are themselves part of self-regulation (Pintrich, 2004). Generative AI is relevant here specifically because it can substantially reduce the effort required to produce an acceptable academic text which means that an assessment method focused only on the finished product risks

overlooking exactly the volitional work that independent learning is meant to capture. Existing instruments for assessing independent learning fall into three broad groups, and each has a weakness that becomes more serious once generative AI is widely available. Product-based assessment—essays, term papers, translations and similar completed work — has always faced the difficulty that a strong text can reflect prior knowledge, external assistance or a familiar topic rather than the process being credited. Generative AI did not create this weakness, but it has widened it considerably.

Self-report instruments, of which the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire is the best known, can show acceptable internal consistency and predict some outcomes at the group level (Pintrich et al., 1993), yet they measure what students believe about their own strategies rather than what they actually did on a specific task. Such instruments collect behavior across unspecified occasions and are therefore not well suited to representing regulation as it is actually enacted, responses may also be influenced by students sense of what an assessor wants to hear (Winne and Perry, 2000). Interviews, supervision meetings and oral defenses are closer to the construct, as they allow direct questioning about specific decisions but they are time consuming, difficult to standardize and rarely leave a systematic record.Next response, increasingly common in practice, is the use of AI-detection software. This does not resolve the underlying problem. A detector can only estimate whether a text was produced with AI assistance it cannot establish whether the student planned effectively, verified information or exercised sound judgement. Even a perfectly accurate detector would show only that assistance occurred, not what that assistance contributed to or displaced. Reliance on detection can also make assessment adversarial in a way that sits uneasily with the developmental purpose of formative assessment (Black and Wiliam, 1998).

Across all three approaches, the same gap reoccurs: the learning process is inferred from an outcome, reported retrospectively without supporting evidence, or observed only briefly. Nguyen et al. (2026) similarly find that even where research on self-regulated learning and research on generative AI in education intersect, the resulting studies concentrate more heavily on task performance than on the assessment of goal setting, regulation or process. Work specific to philology remains particularly limited, which is one of the gaps this article addresses.

Research methodology. Article is conceptual and theory-building in nature rather than empirical its aim is to construct an assessment model from existing theoretical and empirical literature, rather than to test a model against new data. The approach follows established practice for conceptual scholarship in assessment and educational technology research which typically proceeds through the identification of a practical problem, a structured synthesis of relevant theory and the derivation of a framework whose components are explicitly justified by that theory (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Lodge, Thompson and Corrin, 2023).

The literature drawn on falls into three groups. The first consists of foundational theories of self-regulated learning and learner autonomy (Zimmerman, 2002; Holec, 1981; Benson, 2011; Panadero, 2017), which supply the conceptual definition of independent learning used throughout the article. The second consists of research on generative AI in higher education and language education specifically, including work on AI literacy, automated writing evaluation and post-editing (Godwin-Jones, 2022, 2024; Kasneci et al., 2023; Warschauer and Ware, 2006; Ng et al., 2021; Daniel, 2025; Nguyen et al., 2026), which informs the analysis of how generative tools change the evidential value of a finished text. The third consists of literature on assessment design, including formative assessment, feedback literacy and assessment validity and reliability (Black and Wiliam, 1998; Boud and Falchikov, 2006; Winne and Perry, 2000; Winne, 2017), which supplies the criteria against which the proposed model is evaluated in the analysis section.

The proposed of the model (goal setting and planning; strategic action; monitoring and self-evaluation; source and tool literacy) was derived by the phases of self-regulation identified by Zimmerman (2002) and the dimensions of autonomy identified by Holec (1981) onto the specific academic tasks that recur in philology coursework — working with primary texts, bibliographic research, writing, and translation. Each component was then linked to a form of process evidence (interaction records, draft histories, verification notes, reflective commentary, oral defense) that plausibly makes the corresponding self-regulatory action observable, drawing on learning-analytics research showing that behavioral trace data can capture aspects of regulation that retrospective self-report cannot (Winne, 2017).Because the model has not yet been applied empirically, this article does not report data collected from students or institutions. Its contribution is the model itself, together with an explicit account of the theoretical basis for each component, the practical conditions required for implementation, and the limitations that would need to be addressed before the model could be validated, consistent with calls in the literature for staged, comparison-based trialing of new assessment instruments before wider adoption (Dawson, 2021;Boud and Falchikov, 2006). Recommendations for such a trial, including the use of comparison groups are set out in the concluding section.

The proposed model

Building on the foregoing, the article proposes a four-component process-evidence model for assessing independent learning in AI-supported philology tasks, summarized in Table 1.

Component	What is assessed	Primary evidence
Goal setting and planning	Understanding the task, setting realistic goals, dividing work into stages,	Initial plan; early interaction records

Component	What is assessed	Primary evidence
	recognizing gaps in one's own knowledge	
Strategic action	Selection of search, reading and digital-tool strategies, willingness to change approach when ineffective	Full interaction record, sequence of drafts
Monitoring and self-evaluation	Identifying weaknesses, responding selectively to suggestions, judging the quality of one's own work	Student self-assessment compared with assessor judgement
Source and tool literacy	Verifying references, detecting fabricated or inaccurate output, declaring assistance, explaining tool limitations	Verification records; reflective commentary

The four components are interdependent as goals shape the strategies a learner selects, monitoring determines whether those strategies are adjusted, and source literacy affects the reliability of the information on which later decisions are based. Because students may perform unevenly across components, reporting results separately by component is likely to give more useful feedback than collapsing all evidence into a single overall score.

Two additional safeguards strengthen the model. A short structured oral defense allows the assessor to ask about specific decisions documented in the evidence, which makes a rehearsed appearance of independence harder to sustain than a written record alone would. A declaration of assistance, identifying which tools were used and for what purpose, should not be treated as evidence of misconduct in itself its role is to make tool use transparent enough to be evaluated fairly.

Performance descriptors are proposed at three levels for each indicator. At a dependent level, a student accepts generated material with little evaluation and cannot explain important decisions. At an intermediate level, evaluation is visible but applied inconsistently. At an autonomous level, a student systematically checks, selects, modifies or rejects information and justifies those decisions using appropriate disciplinary reasoning. Because these descriptors refer to observable conduct rather than inferred attitude, they should be easier to apply consistently across assessors than judgements based on impression alone. The final product remains part of the assessment since disciplinary knowledge is an outcome in its own right but it should no longer be the sole or dominant indicator of independence; an approximately equal weighting between product and documented process is

proposed as a starting point, to be adjusted by level of study and the results of local trials.

Conclusion and recommendations. The widespread availability of generative AI has changed what a finished text can show. A fluent essay or translation no longer demonstrates that the student planned, verified and revised the work, so it cannot serve as the sole basis for judging independent learning. The difficulty lies not in student's use of AI but in assessment practices that still rely on the product alone.

This article has proposed an alternative in which independent learning is understood as a set of observable actions rather than as the absence of assistance. The model has four components: goal setting and planning, strategic action, monitoring and self-evaluation, and source and tool literacy. Each component is assessed through process evidence, including interaction records, draft histories, verification notes, brief reflective commentary and a short oral defence. In this way the model distinguishes between a student who uses AI to support their own judgement and one who allows it to replace that judgement.

Three recommendations follow. First, instructors need training in interpreting process evidence and conducting structured oral defenses, in addition to familiarity with AI tools. Second, assignments should be designed so that a generic AI-generated response is insufficient, for instance by requiring specified sources or staged submission of work. Third, the model should be introduced in a small number of courses, preferably with a comparison group, before wider adoption.

The model remains conceptual and has not been tested empirically. Its indicators and performance descriptors require classroom trials, and it is not yet known whether students who perform well against them develop stronger independent learning skills over time. Uzbekistan's national strategy for artificial intelligence and its concept for the development of higher education provide a suitable policy context for such trials, although neither specifies how independent work should be assessed when generative AI is widely available. This article is intended as a first step toward addressing that gap. For philology in particular, the productive question is no longer whether a student worked without assistance but how effectively the student directed, verified and used the assistance available.

References:

1. Benson, P. Teaching and Researching Autonomy . Harlow: Pearson Education. (2011).
2. Black, P.and Wiliam, D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice. (1998).
3. Boud,D. and Falchikov, N. Aligning assessment with long-term learning. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, (2006).
4. Daniel, B. K. Can generative AI revolutionize academic skills development in higher education? A systematic literature review. European Journal of Education. (2025).

5. Dawson, P. Defending Assessment Security in a Digital World: Preventing E-Cheating and Supporting Academic Integrity. London: Routledge. (2021).
6. Godwin-Jones, RPartnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. Language Learning and Technology (2022)
7. Godwin-Jones, R. Distributed agency in language learning and teaching through generative AI. Language Learning and Technology . (2024).
8. Holec, H. Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press. (1981).
9. Kasneci, E. Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., et al. ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, (2023).
10. Lodge, J. M., Thompson, K and Corrin, L. Mapping out a research agenda for generative artificial intelligence in tertiary education. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology. (2023).
11. Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W. and Qiao, M. S. Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence. (2021).
12. Nguyen, H., Chen, H.-L and Asfani, K. Supporting self-regulated learning in the age of artificial intelligence: A comparative systematic review of earlier AI and generative AI. Journal of Educational Computing Research (2026).
13. Panadero, E. A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. Frontiers in Psychology. (2017).
14. Pintrich, P. R. A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. Educational Psychology Review (2004).
15. Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T and McKeachie, W. J. Reliability and predictive validity of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). Educational and Psychological Measurement (1993).
16. UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research. Paris: UNESCO.
17. UNESCO. AI Competency Framework for Teachers. Paris. (2024).
18. Warschauer, M and Ware, P. Automated writing evaluation: Defining the classroom research agenda. Language Teaching Research. (2006).
19. Winne, P. H. Learning analytics for self-regulated learning. In C. Lang, G. Siemens, A. Wise and D. Gašević Handbook of Learning Analytics Society for Learning Analytics Research. (2017).
20. Winne, P. H.,and Perry, N. E. Measuring self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich and M. Zeidner , Handbook of Self-Regulation San Diego: Academic Press. (2000).
21. Zawacki-Richter, O. Marín, V. I., Bond, M., and Gouverneur, F. Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education– where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education (2019).

22. Zimmerman, B. J. Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory Into Practice.(2002).

23. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PQ-358 of 14 October 2024 "On approval of the Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies until 2030". Tashkent.

24. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-5847 of 8 October 2019 "On approval of the Concept for the Development of the Higher Education System of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030". Tashkent.

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI

2026-yil
9(2)-son

Muassis - "FAN VA INNOVATSIYA YANGILIKLARI" MCHJ
Jurnal hamkori - «PROFI UNIVERSITY»

Jurnal O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Administratsiyasi huzuridagi axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan 2024-yil 24-may kuni № 454068-sonli guvohnoma bilan ro'yxatga olingan.

Jurnal 2024-yilda tashkil etilgan, 1 oyda bir marta o'zbek, tojik, qozoq, qirg'iz, qoraqalpoq, rus va ingliz tillarida nashr etiladi.

Tahririyat manzili: 190110, Toshkent shahri Uchtepa tumani, Bog'iston MFY, 14-mavze, 8-uy.

Telefonlar: +998 90 749 00 00
+998 90 749 77 77
+998 91 902 05 01
E-mail: saen_2024@mail.ru
Jurnal sayti: www.saen.uz
Telegram kanali: **https://t.me/saen_2024**

Maqolada keltirilgan fakt va ma'lumotlarning to'g'riligi uchun mualliflar mas'uldirlar.

"Fan va ta'lim yangiliklari" ilmiy-amaliy jurnali Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining qarori (25.08.2025 y., №374/5) bilan pedagogika va psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) va fan doktori (DSc) ilmiy darajasiga talabgorlarning dissertatsiyalari asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan milliy ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan.

ISSN: 3093-8694